ST Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

STAT 2

RADIO TV REPORTS, IN

4701 WILLARD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND 20815 656-4068

FOR PAS

PROGRAM Jack Anderson Confidential STATION WJLA-TV ABC Network

DATE October 2, 1982 7:30 P.M. CITY Washington, D.C.

SUBJECT Ariel Sharon

JACK ANDERSON: A smoldering question mark hangs over Israel today: Who is to blame for the massacre of Palestinian refugees? This question will be examined by a board of inquiry. But I've spoken to sources in Israel who know what happened. They tell me that two men are responsible for unleashing the Phalangists. The two are Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Defense Minister Ariel Sharon.

Of course, they didn't approve the massacre. But Israeli intelligence warned in advance that it could happen. Many Israeli officials the real culprit is Sharon. They tell me that Sharon pushed Israel into a war that could have been avoided, that Sharon has now disgraced the Israeli Army.

I spent an evening with Sharon last month at his ranch. He made it clear that he didn't like restrictions.

ARIEL SHARON: When a Jew was killed, immediately we were asked to show self-restraint. I mean from all around the world we got requests, "Please show self-restraint." And believe me, we showed self-restraint for a long time.

ANDERSON: Sharon also tried to justify his military actions in Lebanon.

SHARON: Since the war started in 1975 between the PLO terrorist organization and the Christians, the number of people killed in Lebanon was over 100,000 dead and over 300,000 wounded.

ANDERSON: I've had access to the CIA's secret psychological profile of Sharon. It uses words like brilliant, ruthless and ambitious to describe him. But the word that stands

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

out is ruthless.

In 1953 he led a commando attack that wiped out the Palestinian village of Kibiya (?). Sixty-six people were killed in retaliation for the brutal murder of an Israeli mother and child.

My Israeli sources say that Israel will purge its shame by ousting Ariel Sharon.

When I return, a report on a $6 billion Pentagon boondoggle.

* * *

ANDERSON: Everyone in Washington is for God, country and economy. But the Pentagon favors economy in someone else's budget. Staggering amounts have been lavished on armaments that should have been scrapped or never should have been built in the first place. Today I want to tell you about one of them. The story is reported by my associates Endie Bagwar (?) and Don Goldberg.

These are various models of the anti-tank Maverick missile. Each one costs close to $100,000, and the price is rising. The missile looks impressive. It's an electronic marvel. There's only one problem. It'll cost an estimated $6 billion and it doesn't work.

So last week a select group of Pentagon officials gathered behind closed doors to discuss the problem. What was their solution? They authorized the purchase of 200 missiles that still don't work. Some experts call it a $6 billion boondoggle. Congressional critics agree.

REP. PATRICIA SCHROEDER: If that isn't a boondoggle, I don't know what is. I mean I would not know how you would define a boondoggle if you didn't define the Maverick as a boondoggle.

The cost overruns have been phenomenal. You could even take the cost overruns if they got you something. But to have all the cost overruns and it still doesn't meet the criteria it was to meet and it still doesn't meet its goals, then all you've done is spend money. It's not where it's supposed to be. The people who use it don't like it. And if that isn't a boondoggle, we don't know how to define the word.

ANDERSON: This is a bootleg film of an early Maverick test. The test pilot is complaining that he has failed to find and fix the target in his sights. Here he is complaining that the computer has locked into a tree.

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

MAN: That was a tree.

ANDERSON: The latest version of the Maverick uses an infrared sensor for targetting enemy tanks. But infrared gadgetry is no improvement. In fact, it's worse.

The Maverick does have its defenders. And Air Force spokesman told my office that the Maverick is misunderstood, that it gives the Air Force nighttime capability.

The most powerful proponent is Texas Senator John Tower, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Here's what he has to say.

SENATOR JOHN TOWER: Well, it can be fired from a considerable distance out, two to six miles, which means that the carrier doesn't have to imperil himself to get in close to deliver the ordnance. And, too, it's accurate and can be used in virtually all kinds of weather and at night. None of our existing airborne systems can be used in that way. They have to have visual acquisition and visual targetting.

ANDERSON: Some of the nation's best pilots disagree. One is Colonel Bob Dilger. He led most major bombing and strafing missions over North Vietnam.

COLONEL BOB DILGER: The fact of the matter is, all weapons at this point in time in history require that the pilot detect, search, and find the target with his eyeball. This is limited to somewhere in the order of one mile or less. When you have a camouflaged tank that blends in quite well with the background, it's very difficult, if not impossible, to see much beyond a mile.

REPORTER: How long would you have to maintain a consistent low-flight pattern using a Maverick in order to actually eyeball the target?

COLONEL DILGER: The gun system takes two or three seconds. The Maverick is substantially longer than that, probably in the order of ten seconds or more.

REPORTER: Would that make the pilot more vulnerable to antiaircraft fire?

COLONEL DILGER: Absolutely. Your predictable flight path, straight level flight path, is a problem area for a pilot. He never wants to do that when he's in an area where he can be fired upon. He wants to be unpredictable. He wants to require the enemy to be clairvoyant, to know where he's going to be five or ten seconds from now. And that would give the enemy time to

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3

zero in on that position. If you're going in a straight level flight, then they know where you're going to be.

REP. SCHROEDER: Therefore you're kind of a kamikaze. And nobody likes to be in that position.

With electronics and with our technology where it is today, we should never expose our pilots to that kind of risk. Never.

ANDERSON: We keep spending billions of dollars, meanwhile, on the Maverick. Yet the Air Force has an alternative, which is not only less expensive, but more effective. This is the 30-millimeter cannon. It can be fired at close range with devastating impact. The cost of destroying a tank with a 30-millimeter cannon is $600. The cost of destroying the same tank with a Maverick, if it can be done, is near $100,000.

The Air National Guard has studied the Maverick. The more it finds out about the Maverick, the better the National Guard likes the 30-millimeter gun.

I don't mean to say that the Maverick is ineffective. It's an effective weapon, all right. But unhappily, on a busy battlefield it's effective against our own tanks. You see, the Maverick is a heat-seeking missile. It zeroes in on the heat coming out of a tank's exhaust. And guess which tank has the hottest exhaust in the world? Our own M-1.

In a moment, the makings of a multimillion-dollar scandal involving U.S. military aid to Egypt.

* * *

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/09/05 : CIA-RDP90-00965R000100150041-3